



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,557	08/02/2000	Keiichi Nakajima	P 271790 NI-0005PCTUS	9517
909	7590	09/30/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			KYLE, CHARLES R	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	

3624

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/630,557	Applicant(s) NAKAJIMA, KEIICHI	
	Examiner Charles R Kyle	Art Unit 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-43 and 50-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 44-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

As to the Claims rejected below, they are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. All Claims should be reviewed for clarity.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “transmits to the paying terminal a receipt which notifies the receiving of said purchasing amount.” It is unclear who or what is notified.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “for the paying terminal to confirm the billing terminal, retrieved from said billing terminal database.” It is unclear how confirmation is done or what is retrieved.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “and said processing unit inquires at least one of a registration status....” It is unclear of whom or what inquiry is made.

Art Unit: 3624

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “which transmits an order to inquire said authentication information....” It is unclear of whom or what inquiry is made.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “does not matches....”, which is not grammatically correct.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the phrase “does not essentially requires....”, which is not grammatically correct.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because, the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Specifically the method claim as presented does not claim a technological basis in the pre-amble and the body of the claim. Without a claimed basis, the claim may be interpreted in an alternative as involving no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea and therefore non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In contrast, a method claim that includes in the body of the claim at least one structural / functional interrelationship which can only be computer implemented is considered to have a technological basis [See Ex parte

Art Unit: 3624

Bowman, 61 USPQ2d 1669, 1671 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001) - used only for content and reasoning since not precedential].

In order to over come the 101 rejection above, the following preamble is suggested: "A computer implemented method for ---", or something similar. Also, in the body of the claim include at least one structural / functional interrelationship which can only be computer implemented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-14, 20-22 and 44-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,332,133 *Takayama* in view of US 5,826,241 *Stein et al.*

With respect to Claim 1, see the discussion of Claim 3 below, which Claim is more limited and recites at least the same elements.

Concerning Claim 2, see the discussion of Claims 1 and 4.

As to Claim 3, *Takayama* discloses the invention substantially as claimed including in a settlement apparatus performing a settlement of a transaction, which communicates with a billing terminal performing billing of the transaction and with a paying terminal performing paying of the transaction, the apparatus comprising:

a first communication unit (Fig. 3, ele. 303) connecting to the billing terminal (Fig. 3) via a first communication network (Fig. 3, ele. 313);

a second communication unit (Fig. 1, ele. 104) connecting to the paying terminal (Fig. 1, ele. 100; Fig. 2A, 2B) via second communication network (Fig. 1, ele. 106); and

Art Unit: 3624

a processing unit for processing the settlement of transaction (Fig. 1, eles. 102, 103), said processing unit synchronizing a communication to the billing terminal with a communication to the paying terminal (Col. 45, lines 16-22) when said processing unit sets up a transaction identifying number to identify the transaction (Col. 71, lines 32-40).

Takayama does not specifically disclose that the transmission of the transaction identification number by the paying terminal is an element of synchronization. *Stein* discloses this limitation at Col. 7, line 33 to Col. 9, line 45, particularly Col. 8, lines 11-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* with the transmission of a transaction identifier number because this would provide a uniquely generated identifier to facilitate confirmation that a transaction was valid. See *Stein* at Col. 7, lines 58-60 and Col. 8, line 37 to Col. 9, line 23 for support of this motivation. Note also that both references are directed to settlement of financial transactions; see *Takayama* at Title and Abstract, at least, and *Stein* at Col. 3, line 38 to Col. 4, line 8.

Concerning Claim 4, *Takayama* discloses that the billing terminal communicates over a telephone line at Fig. 1, eles. 110,109. *Takayama* further discloses that the paying terminal connects to the settlement apparatus by radio telephone communications at Col 43, line 59 to col. 44, lines 29.

With respect to Claim 5, see the discussions set forth above. *Takayama* does not specifically disclose that the billing terminal supplies the transaction number to the paying entity for transmission to the settlement apparatus. Official Notice is taken that the concept claimed is

Art Unit: 3624

a variation of the old and well known “challenge-response” authentication technique. For example, in World War II, soldiers would confirm their status as “friend” with a proper response to another soldier’s challenge;(e.g., Mickey... Mouse). In this instance, the response supplied by the billing terminal is the same transaction number that the paying terminal uses to authenticate with the settlement apparatus. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use the challenge response authentication because this would provide a simple yet effective way to authenticate both parties to a transaction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to synchronize both transacting parties using the transaction identification number of *Stein* because this would provide a simple yet effective way to authenticate both parties to a transaction.

Concerning Claim 6, *Takayama* does not specifically disclose that the transmission of the transaction identification number by the paying terminal is an element of synchronization. *Stein* discloses this limitation at Col. 7, line 33 to Col. 9, line 45, particularly Col. 8, lines 11-18.

Concerning Claim 7, *Takayama* discloses receipt of a purchase amount from a billing terminal for settlement at Col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 17.

Concerning Claim 8, see the discussion of Claim 7 and *Takayama* further discloses a settlement completion notification at Col. 11, lines 49-60 and a receipt to the paying terminal of a settled amount at Col. 52, lines 6-10. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to process settlements after purchase confirmation. For example, the simple use of a checksum would provide confirmation of a purchase amount. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3624

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such purchase confirmation in the invention of *Takayama* because this would help assure correct charges to payors.

Concerning Claims 9 and 10, Official Notice is taken that unique identification of financial terminals and confirmation through such identification is old and well known in the financial arts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* with such features to enhance security and reduce loss.

Concerning Claims 11-13, *Takayama* discloses a purchase history at Col. 71, lines 26-58.

With respect to Claim 14, *Takayama* does not specifically disclose that the first communication unit supplies authentication information. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to centralize distribution of secured information, as in the manner claimed. For example, the use of a secure authentication server protected information and improved transaction security. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use authentication information from a central server (first communication unit of a settlement system) because this would provide a secure and convenient way to distribute, receive and authenticate information.

Concerning Claims 20 and 22, *Takayama* does not specifically disclose that authentication is mutually agreed upon. Official Notice is taken that providing choices to customers is old and well known in marketing. For example, *Takayama* discloses providing users with several choices of credit cards at Col. 71, lines 15-40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to also provide

Art Unit: 3624

multiple authentication approaches to enhance customer satisfaction. Further, if no method were agreeable, refusal would be obvious to eliminate risk of loss.

Concerning Claim 21, *Takayama* does not specifically disclose selection of more accurate authentication. Official Notice is taken that such a selection is old and well known in transaction security. For example, less accurate authentication would increase risk of loss. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to select more accurate authentication to reduce risk of loss through fraud.

With respect to Claim 44, see the discussion of Claim 3 and note that *Takayama* is a computer based method using software.

Concerning Claims 45-49, see the discussions set forth above.

Claims 15-19 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,332,133 *Takayama* in view of US 5,826,241 *Stein et al* and further in view of US 5,604,802 *Holloway*.

As to Claim 15, *Takayama* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussions above. *Takayama* does not specifically disclose the use of a facial portrait of a user to authenticate. *Holloway* discloses this limitation at Col. 6, line 39-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use facial image authentication of *Holloway* because this would provide a reliable and effective authentication.

As to Claim 16, *Takayama* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussions above. *Takayama* does not specifically disclose the use of a password to

Art Unit: 3624

authenticate. *Holloway* discloses this limitation at Col. 6, line 39-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use the password authentication of *Holloway* because this would provide a reliable and effective authentication.

As to Claim 17, *Takayama* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussions above. *Takayama* does not specifically disclose the use of requested information to authenticate. *Holloway* discloses this limitation at Col. 6, line 39-41 as a PIN. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use the supplied information of *Holloway* because this would provide a reliable and effective authentication.

Concerning Claim 18, *Takayama* discloses notification of an authentication result at Col. 13, lines 16-37.

As to Claim 19, *Takayama* does not specifically disclose random selection of an authentication means. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to randomly select authentication means. For example, one might first select password and later randomly select biometric authentication. Such random selection reduces the chance that a fraudulent user could predict the required authentication information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Takayama* to use random selection of authentication means because this would make fraud more difficult by presenting more authentication means for fraudulent users to contend with.

Concerning Claim 23, see the discussion of Claims 15 and 16, and Claim 22.

Concerning Claim 24, see the discussions set forth above.

Art Unit: 3624

Concerning Claim 25, see the discussion of Claim 15 and 22.

As to Claim 26, inclusion of additional authentication means would be obvious to enhance security.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kyle whose telephone number is (703) 305-4458. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent A Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

crk
September 27, 2004

Examiner Charles Kyle

